(3) how did the proposal about the reconstruction originate ;

(4) who made the first representation and when, that the condition of the Manapat chira was not satisfactory and that the same had to be improved ;

(5) was there a complaint at the time that Mr. Kuriyedan Pappu referred to in the article had been blocking up the channel of water leading to Survey No. 238-1 ;

(6) how was the complaint disposed of and what relief was granted to the party that complained for the irrigation of the said bit of land ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(1) 327·88 acres.

(2) 447·60 acres.

(3) and (4) The proposal originated from the Malayattur Panchayat. In 1097 that Panchayat represented that if certain improvements were made to the Manapat chira, interests of cultivation would be served better.

(5) Yes.

(6) (a) Mr. Kuriyedan Pappu was ordered to be proceeded against legally ; and

(b) a set of rules were framed for the working of the chira.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—In sub-division 6 (a) it is said that 'Mr. Kuriyedan Pappu was ordered to be proceeded against legally.' What is the matter for which he had to be proceeded against?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Trespass, to the best of my recollection, took place some years ago.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—I suppose it is trespass into the irrigation canal.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—I believe so.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Sub-division (1) and (2) 327·88 acres and 447.60 acres. Does not the enhanced area include land belonging to Kuriyedan Pappu which were not supplied with water before?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—I want notice. I have no definite information.

231. Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(i) if Survey No. 23/1 has been depending upon the Manapat chira from olden times for irrigation ;

(ii) does it come under the category (a), (b), (c) or (d) of the several classes mentioned in rule 1 of the Gazette notification, dated 1st May 1926 (15th Medam 1101) ;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(iii) was the statement mentioned in rule 6 as appended to notification really appended; was it published then or at any time,

(iv) if not, why was it not published at the time?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(a) Yes.

(ii) Category (a).

(iii) No. The statement was published in Kumbham and Karkadagam 1103.

(iv) Probably due to an oversight.

232. Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(i) how far the ayacut published more than 2 years later in July 1928 (Karkadagam 1103) varied from the ayacut proposed to have been appended to the notification, dated 1st May 1926;

(ii) is the area detailed in the ayacut of the latter date July 1928 entirely covered by the area referred to as receiving customary demand in rule 7 of the notification, dated 1st May 1926;

(iii) if the answer is in the negative, will the Government be pleased to give in print a list of the lands that received the customary demand indicating also the crop season at which each of the plots is to get it?

Rao Sahib Mr T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(i), (ii) and (iii) The Member is referred to the notification and the two lists placed on the Council Table.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—About the supply of water to this land the ryots have made representations that the variation mentioned in (1) and (2) has been causing them inconvenience. Will the Government be pleased to say that that matter will be looked into?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Yes, it is being looked into.

Mr. M A. Chakko.—If revision is necessary, will it be undertaken?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Certainly.

233. Mr. M. A. Chakko.—Will the Government be pleased to state.—

if they are aware that Survey No. 238/1 is really a Mundakan land registered as such in the old ozhuku account, but by a mistake was entered as virippu in the settlement accounts, that nevertheless, mundakan crop continued to be raised in it all the time and that this mistake has given rise to so many complications?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly